

REMARKS

Kindly amend Claims 1, 8, 9, 18, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39 as follows. Applicants submit that all amendments are supported by the application-as-filed and that no new matter has been added. Claims 1-16, 18-29, 31-36, and 38-40 are now in the application. Reconsideration of the application is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objects to Applicants' specification in that the previous submission did not list the amendments to the Abstract on a separate page. The amended Abstract is on a separate page in this submission, as required. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the specification is in proper form and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection thereto.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 8, 23 and 36 stand objected to for various informalities. Applicants adopt and implement herein the Examiner's suggestions for clarification. Accordingly, Applicants amend Claims 8, 23 and 36 obviating the objections, whereby withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 9, 10 and 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants amend Claims 9, 18, and 19 per the Examiner's suggestions, thus obviating such rejections to Claims 9, 10 and 18-29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 18, 25, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as anticipated by Shaputis (US 4,068,106).

Amended independent Claim 18 now recites (in part):

-- at least one rim extending radially outwardly from, and along at least a major circumferential portion of, the outer circumferential body surface, said at least one rim which extends radially outwardly further from said drive roll body than the rest of said drive roll.--

Shaputis fails to teach or suggest such, nor do any other references of record, separate or combined. Namely, Shaputis does not teach or suggest a drive roll with at least one rim that extends radially outwardly further from said drive roll body than the rest of the drive roll.

By contrast, the outermost circumferential surfaces of the Shaputis drive roll are equidistant from the axis of rotation. The Shaputis drive roll has segments 60 which are interchangeable. Because of their common size and interchangeability, Shaputis teaches that if a groove or segment is damaged on a segment 60, another can be moved into its place whereby the damaged segment 60 is used as a spacer and not a driving member (Column 4, Lines 26-44).

Accordingly, since the Shaputis drive roll segments 60 are the same size, the outermost portions of the segments 60 share common diameters, whereby none can be called a rim which extends radially outwardly further from said drive roll body than the rest of said drive roll, as in Applicants' invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to and allowance of Claim 18.

Claims 25, 28, and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable, amended Claim 18 and on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to and allowance of Claims 25, 28, and 29.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-16, 18-29, 31-36, and 38-40 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by Bobeczki et al. (US 6,557,742).

Claims 1, 18, and 31 are amended so as to obviate all such rejections.

Amended independent Claim 1 now recites (in part):

-- a non-flexible elevated wire interface, for conveying a weld wire, said elevated wire interface displaced radially outwardly from the outer circumferential body surface. --

Bobeczki fails to teach or suggest such. Actually, Bobeczki expressly teaches away from Applicants' Claim 1. The Bobeczki structure that the Examiner asserts is an elevated wire interface, is flexible cover 36, which, in light of the Bobeczki teaching, can not be a non-flexible material.

Namely, Bobeczki repeatedly teaches the problems associated with e.g. steel drive rolls as used, especially, with aluminum weld wire. Bobeczki seeks to solve these problems by providing flexible cover 36 to a non-flexible drive roll core.

Bobeczki teaches that cover 36 should be made "from a material having a relatively low compressive yield strength, preferably plastic or rubber, so that the cover ... will deflect or deform and thus conform to the cross-sectional contour of a wire W" (Column 8, lines 23-28).

To modify the Bobeczki reference to provide Applicants' non-flexible elevated wire interface would impermissibly render the end device unsuitable for the stated purpose of Bobeczki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to, and allowance of, Claim 1.

Claims 2-16 are allowable as depending from allowable amended Claim 1 and on their own merits, whereby Applicants also ask for withdrawal of the rejections to, and allowance of, Claims 2-16.

Regarding the rejections to Claims 18-29 made in light of Bobeczki, Applicants assert that the arguments made in the previous section, with respect to the rejection of Claim 18 in light of Shaputis, are equally applicable here and in the interest of brevity will not be repeated at length.

However, to summarize such arguments, as applicable here, Applicants point out that the amendment to independent Claim 18 obviates the rejection in light of Bobeczki in that the areas above the grooves 96, asserted as rims, do not define portions which extend radially outwardly further from the drive roll body than the rest of the drive roll.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to, and allowance of, Claim 18.

Claims 19-29 are allowable as depending from, directly or indirectly, allowable amended Claim 18. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to, and allowance of, Claims 19-29.

Turning now to the rejection of Claim 31, Applicants herein amend Claim 31 so as to obviate the rejection. Namely, Claim 31 now recites (in part):

--an elevated wire interface for conveying a weld wire, said elevated wire interface extending radially outwardly from a portion of the outer circumferential body surface, said elevated wire interface defining a width dimension which is less than the width dimension of said drive roll width dimension.--

Bobeczki does not teach or suggest such. Instead, flexible cover 36, asserted as an elevated wire interface, extends along the entire width of the drive roll. In other words, the Bobeczki flexible cover 36 covers the entire outer circumferential surface of the drive roll. Thus, Bobeczki does not teach a wire interface having a width dimension that is less than the width dimension of the drive roll. Bobeczki teaches that the wire interface width dimension and the drive roll width dimension are equivalent.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to and allowance of Claim 31.

Likewise, Applicants assert that Claims 32-36 and 38-40 are allowable as depending from, directly or indirectly, allowable amended Claim 31, as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to, and allowance of, Claims 32-36 and 38-40.

Applicants further submit that all claims as presented herein are allowable over all references of record. Early allowance is respectfully solicited. No fee is believed due at this time. Should any fee be properly due, or if any refund is due, kindly charge same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-2130.

Please feel free to contact me, the undersigned, with any questions, comments or concerns, at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicholas A. Matias, et al.

Date: January 24, 2007

By: Eric J. Lalor
Eric J. Lalor
Attorney for Applicants
(Reg. No. 54,631)

Customer Number: 23482

*Wilhelm Law Service, S.C.
100 W. Lawrence St., 3rd Fl.
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911
Telephone: 920-831-0100
Facsimile: 920-831-0101*